	Case 2:22-cv-00645-KJM-KJN Docume	ent 7 Filed 04/26/22 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	RUTH CAMEL ESTATE,	No. 2:22-cv-645-KJM-KJN PS
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING REQUEST TO SEAL
13	V.	(ECF No. 6.)
14	SHIRLEY NASH WEBER, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff, who is proceeding without counsel in this action, filed a complaint and requested	
18	leave to proceed without paying the filing fee. (ECF No. 2.) See 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (authorizing	
19	the commencement of an action "without prepayment of fees or security" by a person who is	
20	unable to pay such fees). The undersigned granted plaintiff's request, screened the complaint	
21	under Section 1915, found it lacking, and granted leave for plaintiff to file a first amended	
22	complaint. (ECF No. 4.) On April 22, plaintiff submitted her first amended complaint ("1AC")	
23	to the Clerk of Court, but filed alongside it a request to seal the 1AC. (ECF No. 6.) Thus, the	
24	Clerk held the 1AC until the undersigned could review plaintiff's request to seal.	
25	For the reasons that follow, plaintiff's request is denied.	
26	///	
27	Actions where a party proceeds without counsel are referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to	
28	E.D. Cal. L.R. 302(c)(21). <u>See</u> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72.	
		1

DISCUSSION

Requests to seal documents in this district are governed by E.D. Cal. R. ("Local Rule") 141. In brief, Local Rule 141 provides that documents may only be sealed by a written order of the court after a specific request to seal has been made. Local Rule 141(a). However, a mere request to seal is not enough. Local Rule 141(b) requires that "[t]he 'Request to Seal Documents' shall set forth the statutory or other authority for sealing" E.D. Local Rule 141(b).

The court starts "with a strong presumption in favor of access to court records," <u>Center for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Group, LLC</u>, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting <u>Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</u>, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)). "The presumption of access is 'based on the need for federal courts, although independent – indeed, particularly because they are independent – to have a measure of accountability and for the public to have confidence in the administration of justice." <u>Id.</u> (quoting <u>United States v. Amodeo</u>, 71 F.3d 1044, 1048 (2d Cir.1995)). A request to seal material must normally meet the high threshold of showing that "compelling reasons" support secrecy. <u>Id.</u> (citing <u>Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu</u>, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006)).

Plaintiff has not identified legal authority that supports sealing of the first amended complaint. Instead, it appears plaintiff merely wishes to keep the filing from "the public and press." (ECF No. 6.) This is not a compelling reason to seal the amended complaint. Center for Auto Safety, 809 F.3d at 1096. Given this, Local Rule 140(e)(1) requires the Clerk to return the documents to plaintiff. Plaintiff may refile the first amended complaint as is, or may make alterations to it and file a new version (which shall be labeled "first amended complaint"). Plaintiff has until May 15, 2022, to file the amended complaint, should she choose to do so.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's request to seal (ECF No. 6) is DENIED; and
- 2. The Clerk shall RETURN to plaintiff the first amended complaint.
- 26 Dated: April 25, 2022

came.645

KENDALL J. NEWMAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE